REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1 and 3-8 are now present in the application. Claim 1 is independent. No claim has been amended in this Reply. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 [sic., 1 and 3-8] stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Britz, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/02022474, in view of Agurok, U.S. Patent No. 6,369,925, and further in view of Ruziak, U.S. Patent No. 6907,013. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a combination of elements including "a plurality of transmitting units from multiple sources for sending optical signals via optical beams", "a plurality of receiving units for collecting redundant optical signals and combining the redundant optical signals to a single optical signal for conversion into an electrical signal for further processing" and "each of the receiving units further comprises a photodiode for converting the single optical signal into the electrical signal for inputting to the display device by the digital/analog converter." Applicants respectfully submit that the above combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed nor suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

The specification of the present invention on page 2, lines 1-14 discloses:

> To attempt to deliver high resolution video/graphics without the losses associated with information compression, optical wireless units have been

> designed to transport video and graphics. *However, these devices have relied on optical beams which are susceptible to be blocked by the passage of the human body between the transmitter and receiver. Also, they have used automatic beam aiming means to direct the otherwise invisible infrared laser beam used for transmission.* Techniques used with audio information transmission to address the problem of blockage by allowing the optical signal to scatter from surfaces in the environment and arrive at the receiver via multiple paths which are not blocked cannot be used for video/graphics transmission. This is because the arrival of the part of the original signal which follows multiple paths are delayed relative to that part which travels directly between transmitter and receiver by about one nano-second per foot English measure of path length difference, leading to "smearing" of the data pulses far beyond their original pulse width of 1-10 nano-seconds. (Emphasis added).

Therefore, the present invention provides the system to be *applied to a display device,* thereby *receiving wireless signals omni directionally.* The claimed system includes a plurality of transmitting units for sending optical signals via optical beams, and a plurality of receiving units for collecting the redundant optical signals and combining the signals to a single optical signal for conversion into an electrical signal for further processing. In addition, *the object of the system is to solve the weak signal strength problems caused by moving obstacles between the transmitting units and the receiving units or when the optical signal is reflected or deflected.*

The Examiner alleged that Britz in paragraphs [0023] and [0026] discloses "a plurality of transmitting units from multiple sources for sending optical signals via optical beams" as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, Britz merely discloses that the electrical multiplexer 81 accepts multiple independent data signals and combines them into a single signal to modulate laser transmitter 82. In other words, Britz in paragraphs [0023] and [0026] simply discloses that the Electrical multiplexer 81 can combine multiple signals into a single signal and the modulate laser transmitter 82 transmits it. Therefore, Britz at most discloses a SIGNAL transmitting unit.

In addition, Britz discloses an "optical communication system". Agurok discloses a "beam combiner". Ruziak discloses a "network communication link". However, none of three cited references disclose or teach using *a plurality of transmitting units and a plurality of receiving units* to solve the weak signal strength problems caused by moving obstacles between the transmitting units and the receiving units or when the optical signal is reflected or deflected as recited in claim 1. In fact, the present invention is applied to a multimedia system which optically and wirelessly transmits signals. Only the field of Ruziak is similar to the present invention. However what Ruziak discloses is simply conventional art described in the present application. As shown in FIG. 1A, Ruziak uses a single transmitting unit and a single receiving unit, remote units 24 and 26, to transmit/receive signal. If someone *blocks the transmitted-signal when passing or moving between the transmitter and receiver,* it will affect the quality of signals.

Unlike Ruziak, the present invention uses a plurality of transmitting units, and a plurality of receiving units to solve the weak signal strength problems caused by moving obstacles between the transmitting units and the receiving units. These claimed features are clearly absent from Ruziak and the other references.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of independent claim 1 or its dependent claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Joe McKinney Muncy
Registration No.: 32,334
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant